arXiv:1610.05839v1 [math.CO] 19 Oct 2016

Cycles with two blocks in k-chromatic digraphs

Ringi Kim* Seog-Jin Kim† Jie Ma‡ Boram Park§

October 20, 2016

Abstract

Let k and ℓ be positive integers. A *cycle with two blocks* $c(k,\ell)$ is an oriented cycle which consists of two internally (vertex) disjoint directed paths of lengths at least k and ℓ, respectively, from a vertex to another one. A problem of Addario-Berry, Havet and Thomassé [1] asked if, given positive integers k and ℓ such that $k+\ell \geq 4$, any strongly connected digraph D containing no $c(k,\ell)$ has chromatic number at most $k+\ell-1$. In this paper, we show that such digraph D has chromatic number at most $O((k+\ell)^2)$, improving the previous upper bound $O((k+\ell)^4)$ of [6]. In fact, we are able to find a digraph which shows that the answer to the above problem of [1] is no. We also show that if in addition D is Hamiltonian, then its underlying simple graph is $(k+\ell-1)$-degenerate and thus the chromatic number of D is at most $k+\ell$, which is tight.

Keywords: Digraph coloring; Chromatic number; Cycle with two blocks; Strongly connected digraph

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 05C15, 05C20

1 Introduction

Throughout this paper, all graphs G and digraphs D are *simple*, that is, there are no loops and no multiple edges in G or D (though a pair of opposite arcs is allowed in D). Unless otherwise specified, by a path, a walk or a cycle in a digraph D we *always* mean a directed one. The *length* $|P|$ of a walk P is the number of arcs it contains. An *orientation* of a graph G is a digraph obtained by giving a

*Department of Combinatorics and Optimization, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Canada. E-mail: ringikim2@gmail.com.

†Department of Mathematics Education, Konkuk University, Seoul, Republic of Korea. E-mail: skim12@konkuk.ac.kr. This research was supported by Basic Science Research Program through the National Research Foundation of Korea(NRF) funded by the Ministry of Education(NRF-2015R1D1A1A01057008).

‡School of Mathematical Science, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, P.R. China. E-mail: jiema@ustc.edu.cn. Research partially supported by NSFC projects 11501539 and 11622110.

§Department of mathematics, Ajou University, Suwon, Republic of Korea. E-mail: borampark@ajou.ac.kr. This research was supported by Basic Science Research Program through the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) funded by the Ministry of Science, ICT & Future Planning (NRF-2015R1C1A1A01053495).

direction to each edge of G, and the *underlying graph* of a digraph D is the simple graph obtained by ignoring the directions of the arcs. The chromatic number $\chi(D)$ of a digraph D is the chromatic number of its underlying graph. And we say D is *n-chromatic* if $\chi(D) = n$.

A classic theorem of Gallai and Roy [14, 15] says that any n-chromatic digraph contains a path with n vertices. This motivates the study of *n-universal* digraphs, that is, digraphs contained in any n-chromatic digraphs. It is known that n-universal digraphs must be oriented trees (an orientation of an undirected tree), and Burr [4] conjectured that every oriented tree of n vertices is $(2n-2)$-universal, which is remained to be open (for more information see [8, 10, 12, 13]). For positive integers k and ℓ, a *path with two blocks* $P(k,\ell)$ is an orientation of the undirected path of $k+\ell+1$ vertices having two maximal paths, that is, either starting with k forward arcs followed by ℓ backward arcs, or starting with k backward arcs followed by ℓ forward arcs. In [7], El-Sahili conjectured that every path of $n \geq 4$ vertices with two blocks is n-universal. El-Sahili and Kouider [9] proved that every such path is $(n+1)$-universal, and then Addario-Berry, Havet, and Thomassé [1] confirmed the conjecture.

For positive integers k and ℓ, a *cycle with two blocks* $c(k,\ell)$ (or we call it a *2-block cycle*) is a digraph obtained by an orientation of an undirected cycle, which consists of two internally (vertex) disjoint paths of lengths at least k and ℓ, respectively, from a vertex to another one. A natural question is to ask if a digraph with high chromatic number can contain a 2-block cycle $c(k,\ell)$. In [2], Benhocine and Wojda proved that every tournament of $n \geq 4$ vertices contains a 2-block cycle $c(k,\ell)$ for any positive integers k,ℓ with $k+\ell = n$. However, for general digraphs the answer is no: as shown by Gyárfás and Thomassen (see [1]), there exist digraphs with arbitrary large chromatic number which contain no cycles with two blocks. A digraph D is *strongly connected* (or *strong*, for short) if for any two vertices u and v of D, there are a path from u to v and a path from v to u. The authors of [1] noticed that the digraphs found by Gyárfás and Thomassen are not strongly connected, and they proposed the following problem on cycles with two blocks for strongly connected digraphs.

Problem 1.1 (Addario-Berry, Havet, and Thomassé, [1])**.** *Let D be an n-chromatic strongly connected digraph, $n \geq 4$, and let k and ℓ be positive integers such that $k+\ell = n$. Does such D contain a 2-block cycle $c(k,\ell)$?*

This problem also can be viewed as an extension of the following classic theorem of Bondy [3], which asserts the statement for cycles. (A cycle can be considered as a 2-block cycle $c(k,0)$.)

Theorem 1.2 (Bondy, [3])**.** *Any strong digraph D contains a cycle of length at least $\chi(D)$.*

We mention that a different extension of Bondy's theorem was obtained in [5]. Very recently, among other results, Cohen, Havet, Lochet, and Nisse [6] firstly obtained a finite upper bound of $\chi(D)$ for strong digraphs D containing no $c(k,\ell)$. Precisely, they proved the following:

Theorem 1.3 (Cohen, Havet, Lochet, and Nisse, [6])**.** *Let k and ℓ be integers such that $k \geq \ell \geq 2$ and $k \geq 4$, and D a strong digraph with no 2-block cycle $c(k,\ell)$. Then*

$$\chi(D) \leq (k+\ell-2)(k+\ell-3)(2\ell+2)(k+\ell+1).$$

In this paper, we improve the above upper bound $O((k+\ell)^4)$ to $O((k+\ell)^2)$ by using a quite different approach from [6]. The following is our main result.



Figure 1: A tight example for Theorem 1.5

Theorem 1.4. *Let k and ℓ be integers such that $k \geq \ell \geq 1$ and $k \geq 2$, and D a strong digraph with no 2-block cycle $c(k, \ell)$. Then*

$$\chi(D) \leq 2(2k-3)(k+2\ell-1) < 12k^2.$$

As a key step and a result of independent interest, we consider Hamiltonian digraphs and obtain the following tight result. A digraph D is *Hamiltonian*, if it contains a *Hamiltonian cycle*, that is, a cycle passing through all vertices of D. For a positive integer d, a digraph D is *d-degenerate*, if its underlying graph G is d-degenerate, that is, any subgraph of G contains a vertex having at most d neighbors (or having degree at most d) in it. Note that if a graph G is d-generate, then it is $(d+1)$-colorable.

Theorem 1.5. *Let k and ℓ be positive integers such that $k + \ell \geq 3$, and D a Hamiltonian digraph with no 2-block cycle $c(k, \ell)$. Then D is $(k + \ell - 1)$-degenerate, which implies that $\chi(D) \leq k + \ell$.*

When $k = \ell = 1$, if a Hamiltonian digraph D has no 2-block cycle $c(k, \ell)$, then D is an induced cycle and so $\chi(D) \leq 3 = k + \ell + 1$ and the equality holds only when D is an odd cycle. To see the tightness of Theorem 1.5, we consider the strong tournament T in Figure 1, which contains no $c(4, 1)$ and has $\chi(T) = 5$. We remark that this tournament T answers Problem 1.1 negatively (for $k = 4$ and $\ell = 1$).

We introduce some basic notations and terminologies. Let D be a digraph. For two walks P and Q of D, if the terminal vertex of P and the starting vertex of Q are the same, then we denote by $P + Q$ the walk through P and then Q. For a cycle C of D and any two vertices u and v on C, we denote by uCv the subpath of C from u to v along C. For $S \subseteq V(D)$, we denote by $D[S]$ the induced subdigraph of D on the vertex set S. Let G be a graph. For a vertex u of G, the *neighborhood* $N_G(u)$ of u contains all neighbors of u in G, and the *closed neighborhood* $N_G[u]$ of u is defined by $N_G[u] := N_G(u) \cup \{u\}$. In addition, we denote by $\delta(G) = \min_{u \in V(G)} |N_G(u)|$. For a positive integer k, denote $[k] := \{1, 2, ..., k\}$.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we prove Theorem 1.5 for Hamiltonian digraphs. And in Section 3, we complete the proof of Theorem 1.4 for general strong digraphs.

2 Hamiltonian Digraphs: Proof of Theorem 1.5

We devote this section to prove Theorem 1.5. Throughout this section, if D is a digraph, G is its underlying graph, and $S \subset A(D)$, then we allow, with slight abuse of notation, to denote by $E(S)$

for the set of edges of G obtained by ignoring the directions of arcs of S. We begin with the following useful lemma, which will be iteratively applied later.

Lemma 2.1. *Let D be a digraph which has a Hamiltonian cycle C, and G its underlying graph. Suppose that u, v, x, y are four distinct vertices such that $uv, xy \in E(G) \setminus E(C)$ such that $x \in V(uCv)$ and $y \in V(vCu)$ (see Figure 2). For positive integers k and ℓ, if $|uCx| \geq k-1$ and $|vCy| \geq \ell - 1$, then D contains a 2-block cycle $c(k, \ell)$, unless one of the following occurs:*

(a) $|uCx| = k-1$ and $(u,v),(y,x) \in A(D)$, or

(b) $|vCy| = \ell - 1$ and $(v,u),(x,y) \in A(D)$.



(a) (b)

Figure 2: Figures for Lemma 2.1

Proof. Note that there are four difference cases of the directions of the edges uv and xy. If $(u,v),(x,y) \in A(D)$, then $uCx + (x,y)$ and $(u,v) + vCy$ are internally disjoint paths from u to y of length $|uCx| + 1$ and $|vCy| + 1$, respectively. If $(u,v),(y,x) \in A(D)$, then uCx and $(u,v) + vCy + (y,x)$ are internally disjoint paths from u to x of length $|uCx|$ and $|vCy| + 2$, respectively. If $(v,u),(x,y) \in A(D)$, then $(v,u) + uCx + (x,y)$ and vCy are internally disjoint paths from v to y of length $|uCx|+2$ and $|vCy|$, respectively. If $(v,u),(y,x) \in A(D)$, then $(v,u)+uCx$ and $vCy+(y,x)$ are internally disjoint paths from v to x of length $|uCx|+1$ and $|vCy|+1$, respectively. Now it is easy to verify the conclusion, under the above observations. □

The following lemma will be essential for Theorem 1.5.

Lemma 2.2. *Let k and ℓ be positive integers such that $k + \ell \geq 3$. Let D be a Hamiltonian digraph and G its underlying graph. If $\delta(G) \geq k + \ell$, then D contains a 2-block cycle $c(k, \ell)$.*

Proof. Suppose for a contradiction that D has no 2-block cycle $c(k, \ell)$. Let $C = v_0, v_1, ..., v_{n-1}, v_0$ be a Hamiltonian cycle of D, where $n = |V(D)| \geq k + \ell + 1$.

Claim 1: There is no r such that either $v_r v_{r+k+1} \in E(G)$ or $v_r v_{r+\ell+1} \in E(G)$.



Figure 3: Figures for Claim 1

Proof of Claim 1. Suppose that such r exists. By symmetry between k and ℓ, we may assume that $v_0v_{k+1} \in E(G)$. Note that v_0, v_1, …, $v_{k+\ell}$ are distinct vertices in G, since $k+\ell+1 \leq |V(G)|$. Thus v_0v_{k+1} is an edge not in $E(C)$ if $|V(G)| = n > k+2$. To reach the final contradiction, we prove a series of assertions (1.1) $\sim$ (1.4) as follows (see Figure 3 for illustration).

(1.1) $N_G[v_k] = V(v_0Cv_{k+\ell})$.

Suppose not, then in view of $|N_G(v_k)| \geq k+\ell$, v_k has a neighbor $w \in V(v_{k+\ell+1}Cv_{n-1})$ in G. Then $k+\ell+1 \leq n-1$ or $k+2 < n$. Thus the edges v_0v_{k+1} and v_kw are in G but not in $E(C)$. Since $|v_0Cv_k| \geq k$ and $|v_{k+1}Cw| \geq \ell$, Lemma 2.1 then forces a 2-block cycle $c(k,\ell)$ in D. This contradiction completes the proof of (1.1).

(1.2) If $\ell \geq 2$, then $(v_{k+1}, v_0), (v_k, v_{k+\ell}) \in A(D)$.

Suppose that $\ell \geq 2$. Then $v_kv_{k+\ell} \in E(G) \setminus E(C)$. Moreover, $n > k+2$ and so v_0v_{k+1} is not an edge of $E(C)$. By considering the pair of edges v_0v_{k+1} and $v_kv_{k+\ell}$ of G not in $E(C)$, since $|v_0Cv_k| \geq k$ and $|v_{k+1Cv_{k+\ell}}| \geq \ell - 1$, Lemma 2.1 shows that, to avoid $c(k,\ell)$, the orientation of these edges in D are $(v_{k+1}, v_0), (v_k, v_{k+\ell}) \in A(D)$.

(1.3) $k \geq 2$ and thus, v_{k-1} is a vertex distinct from v_0.

Otherwise, $k = 1$ and so $\ell \geq 2$, implying that $(v_k, v_{k+\ell}) \in A(D)$ by (1.2); then the arc $(v_k, v_{k+\ell})$ and the path $v_kCv_{k+\ell}$ together form a 2-block cycle $c(k,\ell)$ (where $k = 1$), a contradiction.

(1.4) $N_G[v_{k-1}] = V(v_0Cv_{k+\ell})$.

Suppose not, then in view of $|N_G(v_{k-1})| \geq k+\ell$, v_{k-1} has a neighbor $w \in V(v_{k+\ell+1}Cv_{n-1})$ in G. Then $k+\ell+1 \leq n-1$ or $k+2 < n$, and so $v_0v_{k+1} \in E(G) \setminus E(C)$. By (1.3), as $k \geq 2$, $v_{k-1} \neq v_0$, and so $v_{k-1}w \in E(G) \setminus E(C)$. By considering two edges $v_0v_{k+1}, v_{k-1}w \in E(G) \setminus E(C)$, since $|v_0Cv_{k-1}| = k-1$ and $|v_{k+1}Cw| \geq \ell$, by Lemma 2.1, we get that $(v_0, v_{k+1}), (w, v_{k-1}) \in A(D)$. We can not have $\ell \geq 2$, as otherwise it would contradict (1.2). Thus, $\ell = 1$, then the path v_0Cv_{k+1} and the arc (v_0, v_{k+1}) form a 2-block cycle $c(k,\ell)$ (where $\ell = 1$), a contradiction. This proves (1.4).

As $k \geq 2$, we now observe that v_0v_k and $v_{k-1}v_{k+\ell}$ are edges of $E(G) \setminus E(C)$. Since $|v_0Cv_{k-1}| = k-1$ and $|v_kCv_{k+\ell}| = \ell$, applying Lemma 2.1, we obtain that $(v_0, v_k), (v_{k+\ell}, v_{k-1}) \in A(D)$. If $(v_{k+1}, v_0) \in A(D)$, then the paths $(v_{k+1}, v_0) + v_0Cv_{k-1}$ and $v_{k+1}Cv_{k+\ell} + (v_{k+\ell}, v_{k-1})$ form a 2-block cycle $c(k,\ell)$ of D, a contradiction. Hence, we must have $(v_0, v_{k+1}) \in A(D)$ and by (1.2), we have $\ell = 1$. Then (v_0, v_{k+1}) and v_0Cv_{k+1} form a 2-block cycle $c(k,\ell)$ (where $\ell = 1$). This completes the proof of Claim 1. □



(i) (ii)

Figure 4: Figures for Lemma 2.2

As $k + \ell \geq 3$, from now on we may assume that $\ell \geq 2$. We choose two vertices u and v such that $uv \in E(G) \setminus E(C)$ and the length of uCv is as small as possible but at least $k+1$. Note that such an edge uv exists as $\delta(G) \geq k + \ell \geq k + 2$. We may assume that $u = v_0$ and $v = v_r$ where $n-1 > r \geq k+1$. By Claim 1, it follows that $r \geq k+2 \geq 3$ (See Figure 4 (i)). We also note that by the minimality of r, v_r has at most $k+1$ neighbors in $V(v_0Cv_r)$ and so it has at least $\ell - 1$ neighbors in $V(v_{r+1}Cv_{n-1})$ and so $\ell - 1 \leq n - r - 1$ and so $r + \ell - 1 \leq n - 1$. Thus, v_0, v_1, $\ldots$, $v_{r+\ell-2}$, $v_{r+\ell-1}$ are all distinct vertices in G.

Claim 2: $N_G[v_{r-1}] = V(v_{r-k-1}Cv_{r+\ell-1})$ and $N_G[v_{r-2}] = V(v_{r-k-2}Cv_{r+\ell-2})$.

Proof of Claim 2. By the minimality of r, we observe that v_{r-1} has no neighbors in $V(v_0Cv_{r-k-2})$. If v_{r-1} has a neighbor w in $V(v_{r+\ell}Cv_{n-1})$, then by Lemma 2.1, the edges $v_0v_r, v_{r-1}w \in E(G) \setminus E(C)$ force a 2-block cycle $c(k, \ell)$ in D, a contradiction. Therefore, $N_G(v_{r-1}) \subseteq V(v_{r-k-1}Cv_{r+\ell-1})$. As v_{r-1} has at least $k + \ell$ neighbors in G, it follows that $N_G[v_{r-1}] = V(v_{r-k-1}Cv_{r+\ell-1})$.

Consider v_{r-2}. If v_{r-2} has a neighbor w in $V(v_{r+\ell}Cv_{n-1})$, then by Lemma 2.1, the edges $v_0v_r, v_{r-2}w \in E(G) \setminus E(C)$ force a 2-block cycle $c(k, \ell)$, a contradiction. Moreover, by Claim 1, $v_{r+\ell-1}$ is not a neighbor of v_{r-2}. Therefore, we conclude that $N_G(v_{r-2})$ is a subset of $V(v_0Cv_{r+\ell-2})$. If $r = k + 2$, then $v_0 = v_{r-k-2}$ and so $N_G(v_{r-2}) \subseteq V(v_{r-k-2}Cv_{r+\ell-2})$. When $r \geq k + 3$, by the minimality of r, one can observe that v_{r-2} has no neighbors in $V(v_0Cv_{r-k-3})$, which implies that $N_G(v_{r-2}) \subseteq V(v_{r-k-2}Cv_{r+\ell-2})$. As $|N_G(v_{r-2})| \geq k + \ell$, it follows that $N_G[v_{r-2}] = V(v_{r-k-2}Cv_{r+\ell-2})$. This proves Claim 2. □

We are ready to arrive at the final contradiction. For simplicity, let (see Figure 4 (ii))

$$y_1 = v_{r-k-2}, \quad u_1 = v_{r-k-1}, \quad x = v_{r-2}, \quad v = v_{r-1}, \quad y_2 = v_{r+\ell-2}, \quad u_2 = v_{r+\ell-1}.$$

By Claim 2, $vu_2, xy_2 \in E(G)$. Note that vu_2 and xy_2 are edges not in $E(C)$, since $n \geq \ell + 2$. Since $|vCy_2| = \ell - 1$ and $|u_2Cx| = n - \ell - 1 \geq k$, by Lemma 2.1, we have $(v, u_2), (x, y_2) \in A(D)$. If $k = 1$, then the arc (v, u_2) and the path vCu_2 form a 2-block cycle $c(k, \ell)$ in D. Thus $k \geq 2$.

By Claim 2 again, $u_1v, xy_1 \in E(G)$. Since $k \geq 2$ and so $n \geq k + 2$, u_1v and xy_1 are edges not in $E(C)$. As $|u_1Cx| = k - 1$ and $|vCy_1| = n - k - 1 \geq \ell$, by Lemma 2.1, we have $(u_1, v), (y_1, x) \in A(D)$. Then the two paths $u_1Cx + (x, y_2)$ and $(u_1, v) + vCy_2$ have the length k and ℓ, respectively, and so

they induce a 2-block cycle $c(k,\ell)$ in D. We reach a contradiction and this completes the proof of Lemma 2.2. □

Now we can derive Theorem 1.5 from Lemma 2.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. It suffices to show that any Hamiltonian digraph D with no $c(k,\ell)$ is $(k+\ell-1)$-degenerate. Suppose the above statement is false, and let D be a counterexample to it with minimum number of vertices. That is, D is an n-vertex Hamiltonian digraph with no $c(k,\ell)$ and is not $(k+\ell-1)$-degenerate, but any Hamiltonian digraph with no $c(k,\ell)$ and with less than n vertices is $(k+\ell-1)$-degenerate. Let G be the underlying graph of D and $C = v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_{n-1}, v_0$ a Hamiltonian cycle of D.

If $\delta(G) \geq k+\ell$, then by Lemma 2.2, D contains a 2-block cycle $c(k,\ell)$, a contradiction. Thus there exists some vertex in G which has neighbors less than $k+\ell$. We may assume $|N_G(v_0)| \leq k+\ell-1$. Let D' be the digraph obtained from D by deleting v_0 and adding an arc (v_{n-1}, v_1), and G' be the underlying graph of D'. Clearly D' is Hamiltonian, G' is an underlying graph of D', and $G - v_0$ is a subgraph of G'. Suppose D' contains a 2-block cycle $c(k,\ell)$, say H'. If the arc (v_{n-1}, v_1) is not in H', then H' is a subgraph of D, which yields a contradiction. Thus H' does use (v_{n-1}, v_1). However, the digraph obtained from H' by replacing the arc (v_{n-1}, v_1) with the path v_{n-1}, v_0, v_1 of length two is a 2-block cycle $c(k,\ell)$ as well, which is contained in D, a contradiction. Hence, the Hamiltonian digraph D' contains no 2-block cycle $c(k,\ell)$. Then by our hypothesis, D' is $(k+\ell-1)$-degenerate, so is G'. Since $G - v_0$ is a subgraph of G' and $|N_G(v_0)| \leq k+\ell-1$, it follows that G (and thus D) is also $(k+\ell-1)$-degenerate. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.5 □

3 Proof of Theorem 1.4

In this section, we will prove Theorem 1.4 for general strong digraphs. The plan is first to reduce the upper bound of $\chi(D)$ to $\chi(F)$ for some special subdigraphs F of a strong digraph D (this part will be done in subsection 3.2); and then we study some structural properties on F in subsection 3.3; and finally in subsection 3.4, we obtain the upper bound for $\chi(F)$ and complete the proof.

3.1 Some notations

In this subsection, we introduce some notations and terminologies which will play important roles in the coming proofs. Let D be a digraph and $S \subset V(D)$. Let D/S denote the *contraction* of S in D, i.e., a digraph obtained by contracting S into a new vertex v_S and adding arcs (x,y) of the following two kinds:

(a) $x = v_S$ and $y \in V(D) \setminus S$, if there exists $(w,y) \in A(D)$ for some $w \in S$, and

(b) $x \in V(D) \setminus S$ and $y = v_S$, if there exists $(x,w) \in A(D)$ for some $w \in S$.

For a vertex $v \in V(D/S)$, the *preimage* $\varphi(v)$ of v is defined by

$$\varphi(v) = \begin{cases} S & \text{if } v = v_S \\ \{v\} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

And for $B \subset V(D/S)$, the *preimage* $\varphi(B)$ of B is defined to be $\varphi(B) = \bigcup_{v \in B} \varphi(v)$.

We say a strong digraph $\mathcal{T}$ is a *cycle-tree* if there is an ordering $C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_m$ of all cycles in $\mathcal{T}$ such that for $2 \leq i \leq m$,

$$\left| \ V(C_i) \cap \left(\cup_{j \in [i-1]} V(C_j)\right) \ \right| = 1.$$

We also say this ordering $C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_n$ is a *cycle-tree ordering* of $\mathcal{T}$. See Figure 5 for an illustration of a cycle-tree. A cycle-tree $\mathcal{T}$ is called a *cycle-path*, if there exists an ordering C_0, C_1, ..., C_m of all cycles of $\mathcal{T}$ such that $|V(C_i) \cap V(C_j)| \leq 1$ for any distinct $i, j \in \{0, 1, \ldots, m\}$, and the equality holds if and only if $|i - j| = 1$. Here, the cycles C_0 and C_m are called the *end-cycles* of $\mathcal{T}$, and the *length* of such a cycle-path is defined to be m.



Figure 5: A cycle-tree with a cycle-tree ordering $C_0, C_1, ..., C_5$.

Cycle-trees have some 'tree-like' properties. For two distinct cycles C, C' of a cycle-tree $\mathcal{T}$, there exists a uniquely determined cycle-path in $\mathcal{T}$ with end-cycles C and C', which we denote by $\Lambda_{\mathcal{T}}(C, C')$. Moreover, for any two vertices $u, v \in V(\mathcal{T})$, there also exist a unique path from u to v and a unique path from v to u in $\mathcal{T}$, which we denote by $u\mathcal{T}v$ and $v\mathcal{T}u$, respectively.

3.2 Reducing $\chi(D)$ to $\chi(F)$

Let k and ℓ be integers such that $k \geq \ell \geq 1$ and $k \geq 2$, and let D be a strong digraph with no 2-block cycle $c(k, \ell)$. In this subsection, we will partition $V(D)$ so that each part induces a certain subdigraph F and show that $\chi(D)$ can be bounded from above by the maximum $\chi(F)$ (see Lemma 3.3).

We first define a sequence of strong digraphs $D^{(0)}$, $D^{(1)}$, ..., $D^{(m)}$ and a sequence of cycles $C^{(0)}$, $C^{(1)}$, ..., $C^{(m-1)}$ as following. Initially, let $D^{(0)} = D$. Now suppose that $D^{(i)}$ has been defined. If $\chi(D^{(i)}) \geq 2k - 2$, then in view of Theorem 1.2, $D^{(i)}$ has at least one cycle of length at least $2k - 2$. Let $C^{(i)}$ be a longest cycle in $D^{(i)}$ and let $D^{(i+1)} = D^{(i)}/V(C^{(i)})$, which is the digraph obtained from $D^{(i)}$ by contracting $V(C^{(i)})$. Otherwise, $\chi(D^{(i)}) \leq 2k - 3$ and we then stop. This procedure is well-defined since for a strong digraph, a contraction of a set of vertices which induces a strong subdigraph is also strong.

We emphasize that the above definition will be fundamental and we will constantly refer to it in the coming proofs. Let us collect some properties on $D^{(j)}$ and $C^{(j)}$. It is clear that $\chi(D^{(m)}) \leq 2k-3$, and $C^{(i)}$ is a subgraph of $D^{(i)}$ for each $i \in \{0, 1, ..., m-1\}$. Denote the collection of the lengths of $C^{(i)}$'s by

$$L := \{|C^{(0)}|, |C^{(1)}|, \ldots, |C^{(m-1)}|\}.$$

The following is also easily obtained from the fact that each $C^{(j)}$ is chosen to be a longest one in $D^{(j)}$. We omit the proof.

Proposition 3.1. $|C^{(0)}| \geq |C^{(1)}| \geq \ldots \geq |C^{(m-1)}| \geq 2k-2$.

For each $j \in \{0, 1, ..., m\}$, $D^{(j)}$ is also a strong digraph with no 2-block cycle $c(k, \ell)$.

Proposition 3.2. *For each $j \in \{0, 1, ..., m\}$, $D^{(j)}$ contains no $c(k, \ell)$.*

Proof. We prove by induction on j. The base case $j = 0$ follows as D contains no $c(k, \ell)$. Suppose that $D^{(j)}$ contains no $c(k, \ell)$. If $D^{(j+1)} = D^{(j)}/C^{(j)}$ contains a 2-block cycle $c(k, \ell)$ (call this subdigraph H), then it is straightforward to see that the subdigraph of $D^{(j)}$ obtained from H by un-contracting $C^{(j)}$ also contains a 2-block cycle $c(k, \ell)$, a contradiction. This proves the proposition. □

For each $v \in V(D^{(m)})$ and $j \in [m]$, we recursively define the j^{th} *preimage* $\varphi^{(j)}(v)$ of v as following: let $\varphi^{(1)}(v) = \varphi(v) \subseteq V(D^{(m-1)})$ and for $2 \leq j \leq m$,

$$\varphi^{(j)}(v) = \varphi\left(\varphi^{(j-1)}(v)\right) \subseteq V(D^{(m-j)}).$$

In particular, $\varphi^{(m)}(v) \subseteq V(D)$. So $\varphi^{(m)}(v)$ for all $v \in V(D^{(m)})$ form a partition of $V(D)$.

We are ready to prove the main lemma of this subsection.

Lemma 3.3. *It holds that*

$$\chi(D) \leq (2k-3) \times \max_{v \in V(D^{(m)})} \chi(D[\varphi^{(m)}(v)]).$$

Proof. Let $t := \max \chi(D[\varphi^{(m)}(v)])$ over all $v \in V(D^{(m)})$. We recall that $\chi(D^{(m)}) \leq 2k-3$. So $V(D^{(m)})$ can be partitioned into $2k-3$ independent sets, say $B_1, B_2, \ldots, B_{2k-3}$. (Here it is possible that $B_i = \emptyset$ for some $i \in [2k-3]$.) For each $i \in [2k-3]$, let V_i be the union of $\varphi^{(m)}(v)$ over all $v \in B_i$. So $V_1, ..., V_{2k-3}$ form a partition of $V(D)$. Since B_i is independent in $D^{(m)}$, it is easy to see that for distinct vertices u and v of B_i, there are no arcs between $\varphi^{(m)}(u)$ and $\varphi^{(m)}(v)$ in D. This shows that for each $i \in [2k-3]$, the chromatic number of each induced subdigraph $D[V_i]$ is at most t, implying that $\chi(D) \leq (2k-3) \cdot t$. This completes the proof of Lemma 3.3 □

In the rest of this section, we denote by $F := D[\varphi^{(m)}(s)]$ for an arbitrary vertex $s \in V(D^{(m)})$.

3.3 Properties on F

In the following two lemmas we obtain some useful properties on F. Recall that L is the set of lengths of cycles $C^{(i)}$'s.

Lemma 3.4. *If F has more than one vertex, then F contains a cycle-tree $\mathcal{T}$ as a spanning subdigraph such that the length of every cycle of $\mathcal{T}$ is from L (and thus at least $2k-2$).*

Proof. Recall that for each $j \in [m]$, the j^{th} preimage $\varphi^{(j)}(v)$ is a subset of $V(D^{(m-j)})$. Let

$$D_j := D^{(m-j)}[\varphi^{(j)}(v)].$$

We prove by induction on $j \in [m]$ that every D_j either consists of $\{v\}$, or contains a cycle-tree $\mathcal{T}_j$ as a spanning subdigraph such that the length of every cycle of $\mathcal{T}$ is from L. This is clearly sufficient, as $F = D_m$. The base case $j = 1$ is trivial, as by definition, $\varphi(v)$ is either $\{v\}$ or the cycle $C^{(m-1)}$ which is a spanning cycle-tree of D_1.

Now suppose that the statement holds for some $j \in [m]$ and we consider D_{j+1}. If D_j consists of $\{v\}$ (i.e., $\varphi^{(j)}(v) = \{v\}$), then $\varphi^{(j+1)}(v) = \{v\}$ or $C^{(m-j-1)}$, and similarly as the base case, we see that the statement also holds for D_{j+1}. Hence, we may assume that D_j contains a cycle-tree $\mathcal{T}_j$ as a spanning subdigraph such that the length of every cycle of $\mathcal{T}_j$ is from L.

We point out that D_j and D_{j+1} are induced subgraphs of $D^{(m-j)}$ and $D^{(m-j-1)}$, respectively, and $D^{(m-j)} = D^{(m-j-1)}/C^{(m-j-1)}$, where the new vertex of $D^{(m-j)}$, say u, is obtained by contracting the cycle $C := C^{(m-j-1)}$. If $\varphi^{(j+1)}(v) = \varphi^{(j)}(v)$, then clearly $D_{j+1} = D_j$ and we are done. So we may assume that $\varphi^{(j+1)}(v) \neq \varphi^{(j)}(v)$. Then it must be the case that $u \in \varphi^{(j)}(v) = V(D_j)$ and thus $V(D_{j+1}) = (V(D_j) \setminus \{u\}) \cup V(C)$. In fact, we also have $D_j = D_{j+1}/C$.

Since u is a vertex of D_j and D_j contains a spanning cycle-tree $\mathcal{T}_j$ with the described property, there exists a non-empty set $\mathcal{C}$ of cycles in $\mathcal{T}_j$ containing the vertex u. Take C' to be any cycle in $\mathcal{C}$. Then there exist $x', y' \in V(C') \setminus \{u\}$ such that (x', u) and (u, y') are the two arcs of C' incident to u. Un-contracting back to D_{j+1}, we see there are two arcs (x', x) and (y, y') of D_{j+1} for some $x, y \in V(C)$.

We claim that $x = y$ for every such $C' \in \mathcal{C}$. Suppose for a contradiction that $x \neq y$. Then there exists a path $P := (y, y') + y'C'x' + (x', x)$ in D_{j+1} from y to x such that

$$|P| \geq 1 + (|C'| - 2) + 1 = |C'| \geq 2k - 2 \geq k,$$

where the last inequality is from $k \geq 2$. If $|yCx| \geq \ell$, then the paths P and yCx are internally disjoint paths in D_{j+1} from y to x of length at least k and ℓ, respectively, and thus they form a 2-block cycle $c(k, \ell)$ in D_{j+1} (and thus in $D^{(m-j-1)}$), a contradiction to Proposition 3.2. So we have $|yCx| \leq \ell - 1$. Then $Q := P + xCy$ is a cycle in D_{j+1} such that (note $k \geq \ell$ and $k \geq 2$)

$$|Q| = |P| + |C| - |yCx| \geq (2k - 2) + |C| - (\ell - 1) > |C|,$$

contradicting the fact that $C = C^{(m-j-1)}$ is a longest cycle in $D^{(m-j-1)}$. This proves $x = y$.

For any $C' \in \mathcal{C}$, we update C' to be a cycle C'' in D_{j+1} by replacing $(x', u), (u, y')$ with $(x', x), (x, y')$. Clearly, $|C''| = |C'| \in L$. We then can define a subdigraph $\mathcal{T}_{j+1}$ of D_{j+1} to be obtained from $\mathcal{T}_j$ by replacing all cycles $C' \in C$ with the corresponding C'' and by adding the new cycle $C^{(m-j-1)}$. It is easy to check that $\mathcal{T}_{j+1}$ indeed is a spanning cycle-tree of D_{j+1}, and the length of every cycle of $\mathcal{T}_{j+1}$ is from L. This finishes the proof of Lemma 3.4. □

Remark. From the proof of Lemma 3.4, we also see that during the contraction process (say from $D^{(m-j-1)}$ to $D^{(m-j)}$ by contracting the cycle $C = C^{(m-j-1)}$), either the spanning cycle-tree $\mathcal{T}_{j+1}$ of D_{j+1} remains unchanged, or C is a cycle in $\mathcal{T}_{j+1}$ and $\mathcal{T}_j = \mathcal{T}_{j+1}/C$. Hence, if we look at the whole

contraction process, at each step the spanning cycle-tree $\mathcal{T}$ of F will either remain the same or contract one of its cycles.

From now on, we assume that F has at least two vertices and let $\mathcal{T}$ be a fixed cycle-tree of F guaranteed in Lemma 3.4. An arc (x, y) in F is called an *external arc* (with respect to $\mathcal{T}$), if there is no cycle of $\mathcal{T}$ containing both x and y. The following lemmas tells that for an external arc (x, y) in F, the path $y\mathcal{T}x$ must be short.

Lemma 3.5. *Suppose that F has an external arc (x, y). Let C_x and C_y be the cycles of $\mathcal{T}$ containing x and y, respectively, such that $|\Lambda_{\mathcal{T}}(C_x, C_y)|$ is the minimum. Let u and v be the common vertices of the first and the last two cycles of the cycle-path $\Lambda_{\mathcal{T}}(C_x, C_y)$, respectively. Then both $|v\mathcal{T}x|$ and $|y\mathcal{T}u|$ are at most $\ell - 2$.*

Proof. Let $\Lambda_{\mathcal{T}}(C_x, C_y) : C_0, C_1, \ldots, C_t$ for some $t \geq 1$. By Lemma 3.4, the length of each C_i is from L and at least $2k - 2$. Let γ be the maximum of $|C_i|$ over $0 \leq i \leq t$. Since $t \geq 1$, we have $\sum_{i=0}^{t} |C_i| \geq \gamma + (2k - 2)$.

Let $j \in [m]$ be the minimum integer such that $|C^{(j)}| = \gamma$. By the minimality, we point out that all contracting cycles $C^{(i)}$ obtained before $D^{(j)}$ have lengths strictly bigger than γ. By the remark after Lemma 3.4, this also shows that all cycles in $\Lambda_{\mathcal{T}}(C_x, C_y)$ have not been contracted before $D^{(j)}$, and as a result, $D^{(j)}$ contains the induced subdigraph H of F restricted on $\Lambda_{\mathcal{T}}(C_x, C_y)$.

Note that by the choice of C_x and C_y, $x \neq u, v$ and $y \neq u, v$. We first prove that $|v\mathcal{T}x| \leq \ell - 2$. Suppose for a contradiction that $|v\mathcal{T}x| \geq \ell - 1$. If $|v\mathcal{T}y| \geq k$, then $v\mathcal{T}x + (x, y)$ and $v\mathcal{T}y$ are internally disjoint paths from v to y of length at least ℓ and k, giving a 2-block cycle $c(k, \ell)$, a contradiction. Hence, $|v\mathcal{T}y| \leq k - 1$, implying that $|y\mathcal{T}v| \geq \ell - 1$ (as $C_t = v\mathcal{T}y + y\mathcal{T}v$). If $|x\mathcal{T}v| \geq k$, then the paths $(x, y) + y\mathcal{T}v$ and $x\mathcal{T}v$ generate a 2-block cycle $c(k, \ell)$ in D, a contradiction. So $|x\mathcal{T}v| \leq k - 1$. Let $C = (x, y) + y\mathcal{T}x$. Then C is a cycle with length

$$|C| \;=\; \sum_{i=0}^{t} |C_i| + 1 - |x\mathcal{T}v| - |v\mathcal{T}y| \geq \gamma + (2k - 2) + 1 - (k - 1) - (k - 1) > \gamma.$$

Note that C is also a cycle of H and also a cycle of $D^{(j)}$. However, this is a contradiction, as $C^{(j)}$ has length γ and is a longest cycle in $D^{(j)}$. Therefore, it cannot happen that $|v\mathcal{T}x| \geq \ell - 1$, and so $|v\mathcal{T}x| \leq \ell - 2$.

We then show that $|y\mathcal{T}u| \leq \ell - 2$. Suppose not that $|y\mathcal{T}u| \geq \ell - 1$. Then the paths $(x, y) + y\mathcal{T}u$ has length at least ℓ. To avoid a 2-block cycle $c(k, \ell)$, we must have $|x\mathcal{T}u| \leq k - 1$. But we also have $|u\mathcal{T}x| \leq |v\mathcal{T}x| \leq \ell - 2$. Therefore $|C_0| = |x\mathcal{T}u| + |u\mathcal{T}x| \leq (k - 1) + (\ell - 2) < 2k - 2$, a contradiction. This completes the proof. □

Remark. From the proof of Lemma 3.5, we know that if F has an external arc (x, y), then it cannot happen that $|v\mathcal{T}x| \geq \ell - 1$. This implies that if F has an external arc, then $\ell \geq 2$.

3.4 Coloring F

In this subsection, our goal is to find a proper coloring of F using $O(k + \ell)$ colors, which completes the proof of Theorem 1.4. Recall that $\mathcal{T}$ is the spanning cycle-tree of F (fixed from Lemma 3.4). Fix a cycle-tree ordering $C_0, C_1, \ldots, C_n$ of $\mathcal{T}$. For simplicity, we write $\Lambda_{\mathcal{T}}(C_i, C_j)$ as $\Lambda(C_i, C_j)$.

We define two spanning subdigraphs $F^{(1)}$ and $F^{(2)}$ of F such that $A(F) = A(F^{(1)}) \cup A(F^{(2)})$. Before processing, we need to introduce some notations. Let C be a cycle in $\mathcal{T}$ with $C \neq C_0$. We call the second last cycle in $\Lambda(C_0, C)$ the *parent* of C and denote it as $p(C)$. The unique vertex $p \in V(C) \cap V(p(C))$ is called the *parent vertex* of C. Note that the notions of the parent cycle and the parent vertex are uniquely defined for all cycles of $\mathcal{T}$ except C_0. For every $v \in V(F)$, let C_v be the cycle of $\mathcal{T}$ containing v which has the shortest cycle-path to the cycle C_0.

We then define a function $\phi : V(\mathcal{T}) \to \{0, 1\}$ by letting

$$\phi(v) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } C_v \neq C_0 \text{ and } |vC_vp_v| (= |v\mathcal{T}p_v|) \leq \ell - 2, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where p_v is the parent vertex of C_v, respectively. Let $F^{(2)}$ be the spanning subdigraph of F such that

$$A(F^{(2)}) = \{(u, v) \mid (u, v) \text{ is an external arc of } F \text{ and } \phi(u) \neq \phi(v)\}.$$

Let $F^{(1)}$ be the spanning subdigraph of F such that $A(F^{(1)}) = A(F) \setminus A(F^{(2)})$. Clearly, ϕ is a proper coloring of $F^{(2)}$ and thus we have

$$\chi(F^{(2)}) \leq 2. \tag{3.1}$$

To complete the proof of Theorem 1.4, it suffices (as we should see later) to show $\chi(F^{(1)}) \leq k + 2\ell - 1$. This will be accomplished in Lemma 3.8 which in fact provides a slightly stronger result. In what follows, we first prove a useful lemma, showing that the external arcs of $F^{(1)}$ satisfy some tree-like property.[1] For an external arc (u, v) of F, we say (u, v) is *comparable* if either C_u is a cycle in $\Lambda(C_v, C_0)$ or C_v is a cycle in $\Lambda(C_u, C_0)$.

Lemma 3.6. *All external arcs of $F^{(1)}$ are comparable.*

Proof. Suppose for a contradiction that $F^{(1)}$ contains an external arc (u, v) which is not comparable. Note that $\ell \geq 2$ by a remark after Lemma 3.5, and C_u, C_v, C_0 are three distinct cycles of $\mathcal{T}$. Let p_u and p_v be the parent vertices of C_u and C_v, respectively. Also note that as (u, v) is not comparable, p_u and p_v are the common vertices of the first and the last two cycles in $\Lambda(C_u, C_v)$, respectively.

We claim that $\phi(u) = 0$ and $\phi(v) = 1$. If $\phi(u) = 1$, then $|uC_up_u| \leq \ell - 2$ and so

$$|p_v\mathcal{T}u| \geq |p_u\mathcal{T}u| = |p_uC_uu| = |C_u| - |uC_up_u| \geq (k + \ell - 2) - (\ell - 2) = k > \ell - 2,$$

a contradiction to Lemma 3.5. Thus $\phi(u) = 0$. If $\phi(v) = 0$, then $|vC_vp_v| \geq \ell - 1$ and so

$$|v\mathcal{T}p_u| \geq |v\mathcal{T}p_v| = |vC_vp_v| > \ell - 2,$$

again a contradiction to Lemma 3.5. Thus $\phi(v) = 1$.

Therefore, $\phi(u) \neq \phi(v)$, implying that $(u, v) \notin F^{(1)}$. This completes the proof. □

Recall that we have fixed a cycle-tree ordering $C_0, C_1, \ldots, C_n$ of $\mathcal{T}$. For every $i \in [n]$, let p_i be the parent vertex of C_i. And for every $i \in \{0, 1, ..., n\}$, let F_i be the induced subdigraph of $F^{(1)}$ restricted on $V(C_0) \cup V(C_1) \cup ... \cup V(C_i)$. Note that $F_0 = F[V(C_0)]$ and $F_n = F^{(1)}$.

[1] It may help understand the proof if one analogizes this as the property of the depth-first-search tree.



Figure 6: $\Lambda := \Lambda(C_i, C_0)$

Lemma 3.7. *For every $i \in [n]$ and for any $v \in V(C_i) \setminus \{p_i\}$, the number of external neighbors* [2] *of v in F_i is at most* $\max\{0, \ell - 2\}$.

Proof. If F has no external arc, then it is trivial. Suppose that F has an external arc. Then $\ell \geq 2$ by the remark after Lemma 3.5. Fix $i \in [n]$ and $v \in V(C_i) \setminus \{p_i\}$. Let $\Lambda = \Lambda(C_i, C_0)$. By the definition of the cycle-tree ordering, it follows that all cycles in Λ are contained in $V(F_i)$. In view of Lemma 3.6, we see that all external arcs of F_i between $V(C_i)$ and $V(F_{i-1})$ are those between $V(C_i)$ and $\Lambda \setminus V(C_i)$. Therefore, to prove the lemma, it suffices to show that the number of external neighbors of v in Λ is at most $\ell - 2$.

Let $S^+(v)$ be the set of vertices u on Λ such that (v, u) is an external arc of $F^{(1)}$, and let $S^-(v)$ be the set of vertices u on Λ such that (u, v) is an external arc of $F^{(1)}$. Note that the parent vertex p_i of C_i is the common vertex of the first two cycles in Λ. Let w be the common vertex of the last two cycles in Λ. So $w \in V(C_0)$. Let w^+ and w^- be the vertices of C_0 such that $|wC_0w^+| = \ell - 2$ and $|w^-C_0w| = \ell - 2$ (see Figure 6).

Claim 1: If $S^+(v) \neq \emptyset$, then $\phi(v) = 0$ and $|S^+(v)| \leq \ell - 2$.

Proof of Claim 1. Suppose that we take any $u \in S^+(v)$. We first prove that

$$|u\mathcal{T}p_i| \leq \ell - 2 \text{ and } \phi(v) = \phi(u) = 0. \tag{3.2}$$

To see this, note that $\Lambda(C_i, C_u)$ is a subpath of Λ. So p_i is the common vertex of the first two cycles in $\Lambda(C_i, C_u)$. Let z be the common vertex of the last two cycles in $\Lambda(C_i, C_u)$. By Lemma 3.5, we have $|u\mathcal{T}p_i| \leq \ell - 2$ and $|p_iC_iv| = |p_i\mathcal{T}v| \leq |z\mathcal{T}v| \leq \ell - 2$, implying that $|vC_ip_i| \geq 2k - 2 - (\ell - 2) > \ell - 2$ and so $\phi(v) = 0$. Since (v, u) is an external arc in $F^{(1)}$, we have $\phi(u) = \phi(v) = 0$.

We then assert that $S^+(v) \subseteq V(w^-\mathcal{T}p_i)$. Otherwise, there exists some $u \in S^+(v)$ such that $u \notin V(w^-\mathcal{T}p_i)$. If $u \in V(C_0)$, then by the definition of w^-, we have $|u\mathcal{T}p_i| > |w^-C_0w| = \ell - 2$, a contradiction to (3.2). So $C_u \neq C_0$ and the parent vertex p_u of C_u is well-defined. To have $u \notin V(w^-\mathcal{T}p_i)$ and $\phi(u) = 0$, we must have $u \in zC_up_u$ and $|uC_up_u| > \ell - 2$, implying that $|u\mathcal{T}p_i| \geq |uC_up_u| > \ell - 2$, again a contradiction to (3.2). This proves the assertion.

Now let $u \in S^+(v)$ be the farthest vertex from p_i in the path $w^-\mathcal{T}p_i$. Then $S^+(v) \subseteq V(u\mathcal{T}p_i)\setminus\{p_i\}$. By (3.2), $|S^+(v)| \leq |V(u\mathcal{T}p_i) \setminus \{p_i\}| = |u\mathcal{T}p_i| \leq \ell - 2$, proving Claim 1. □

Claim 2: If $S^-(v) \neq \emptyset$, then $\phi(v) = 1$ and $|S^-(v)| \leq \ell - 2$.

[2] We say u is an *external neighbor* of v in F if (u, v) or (v, u) is an external arc of F.

Proof of Claim 2. This will be similar to Claim 1. We first prove that for any $u \in S^-(v)$,

$$|p_i\mathcal{T}u| \le \ell - 2 \text{ and } \phi(v) = \phi(u) = 1. \tag{3.3}$$

It is clear that the common vertex of the last two cycles in $\Lambda(C_u, C_i)$ is p_i. Let z be the common vertex of the first two cycles in $\Lambda(C_u, C_i)$. Then by Lemma 3.5, we have $|p_i\mathcal{T}u| \le \ell - 2$ and $|v\mathcal{T}p_i| \le |v\mathcal{T}z| \le \ell - 2$, the latter of which implies that $\phi(v) = 1$. Since (u, v) is an external arc in $F^{(1)}$, $\phi(u) = \phi(v) = 1$.

Next we show $S^-(v) \subseteq V(p_i\mathcal{T}w^+)$. Suppose not, then there exists some $u \in S^-(v)$ such that $u \notin V(p_i\mathcal{T}w^+)$. If $u \in V(C_0)$ (so $u \in w^+C_0w$), then by the definition of w^+, $|p_i\mathcal{T}u| > |wC_0w^+| = \ell - 2$, a contradiction to (3.3). Thus, $C_u \neq C_0$ and the parent vertex p_u is well-defined. To have $\phi(u) = 1$ and $u \notin p_i\mathcal{T}w^+$, it must hold that $u \in p_uC_uz$ and $|uC_uz| \le |uC_up_u| \le \ell - 2$, implying that

$$|p_i\mathcal{T}u| \ge |zC_uu| = |C_u| - |uC_uz| \ge (2k-2) - (\ell-2) > \ell - 2,$$

a contradiction to (3.3).

Let $u \in S^-(v)$ be the farthest vertex from p_i in the path $p_i\mathcal{T}w^+$. Then $S^-(v) \subseteq V(p_i\mathcal{T}u) \setminus \{p_i\}$. By (3.3), $|S^-(v)| \le |p_i\mathcal{T}u| \le \ell - 2$. This proves Claim 2. □

Claims 1 and 2 also show that at most one of $S^+(v)$ and $S^-(v)$ can be non-empty. Therefore, since the number of external neighbors of v in Λ is $\max\{|S^+(v)|, |S^-(v)|\}$, it is at most $\ell - 2$. We have completed the proof of Lemma 3.7. □

Lemma 3.8. *$F^{(1)}$ is $(k + 2\ell - 2)$-degenerate.*

Proof. If F has no external arc, then it is clear that from Theorem 1.5, F is $(k + \ell - 1)$-degenerate by considering the cycles C_n, ..., C_0 (the reverse of the cycle-tree ordering) one by one. In the following, we assume that F has an external arc and so $\ell \ge 2$ by a remark after Lemma 3.5.

We prove by induction on $i \in \{0, 1, ..., n\}$ that each of F_i is $(k + 2\ell - 2)$-degenerate. Note that this is sufficient, as $F_n = F^{(1)}$. The base case $i = 0$ follows from Theorem 1.5 directly: since $F_0 = F[V(C_0)]$ is Hamiltonian with no 2-block cycle $c(k, \ell)$, F_0 is $(k + \ell - 1)$-degenerate and thus $(k + 2\ell - 2)$-degenerate.

Suppose that F_{i-1} is $(k + 2\ell - 2)$-degenerate. Consider F_i, which is the union of F_{i-1}, $F[V(C_i)]$ and the external arcs between $V(C_i)$ and F_{i-1}. As $F[V(C_i)]$ is Hamiltonian with no $c(k, \ell)$, by Theorem 1.5, we know $F[V(C_i)]$ is $(k+\ell-1)$-degenerate. So there exists a linear ordering v_1, ..., v_t of $V(C_i) \setminus \{p_i\}$ such that for any $j \in [t]$, v_j has at most $k + \ell - 1$ neighbors in $F[\{v_1, ..., v_{j-1}\}]$. And Lemma 3.7 says that every vertex in $V(C_i)\setminus\{p_i\}$ has at most $\max\{0, \ell-2\} = \ell-2$ external neighbors in $V(F_{i-1}) \setminus \{p_i\}$. Combining the above, the ordering v_1, ..., v_t of $V(C_i) \setminus \{p_i\}$ also satisfies that for any $j \in [t]$, v_j has at most $(k+\ell-1)+(\ell-2)+1 = k+2\ell-2$ neighbors in $F[V(F_{i-1})\cup\{v_1, ..., v_{j-1}\}]$. This, together with that F_{i-1} is $(k+2\ell-2)$-degenerate, implies that F_i is also $(k+2\ell-2)$-degenerate, finishing the proof of Lemma 3.8. □

Finally, we are ready to prove Theorem 1.4.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Let D be a strong digraph with no 2-block cycle $c(k,\ell)$. Among all vertices in $V(D^{(m)})$, choose $v \in V(D^{(m)})$ such that $F := D[\phi^{(m)}(v)]$ has the maximum $\chi(F)$. Define $F^{(1)}$ and $F^{(2)}$ as before. By (3.1) and Lemma 3.8, there exist proper colorings $\rho_1 : V(F) \to [k+2\ell-1]$ of $F^{(1)}$ and $\rho_2 : V(F) \to \{0,1\}$ of $F^{(2)}$, respectively. Define $\rho : V(F) \to [k+2\ell-1] \times \{0,1\}$ by letting for every $v \in V(F)$, $\rho(v) = (\rho_1(v), \rho_2(v))$. Since $A(F) = A(F^{(1)}) \cup A(F^{(2)})$, it is easy to verify that ρ is a proper coloring of F, which implies that $\chi(F) \leq 2(k+2\ell-1)$. By Lemma 3.3, it holds that $\chi(D) \leq 2(2k-3)(k+2\ell-1)$. □

It will be interesting to improve the upper bound of Theorem 1.4 further, for instance, to $O(k+\ell)$. We direct interested readers to [6] and the survey [11] for many related problems.

References

[1] L. Addario-Berry, F. Havet, and S. Thomassé, Paths with two blocks in n-chromatic digraphs, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 97 (2007), 620–626.

[2] A. Benhocine and A. P. Wojda, On the existence of specified cycles in a tournament, *J. Graph Theory* 7 (1983), 469–473.

[3] J.A. Bondy, Diconnected orientations and a conjecture of Las Vergnas, *J. London Math. Soc.* 14 (1976), 277–282.

[4] S.A. Burr, Subtrees of directed graphs and hypergraphs, in: Proceedings of the Eleventh Southeastern Conference on Combinatorics, Graph Theory and Computing, Boca Raton, Congr. Numer. 28 (1980), 227–239.

[5] Z. Chen, J. Ma, and W. Zang, Coloring digraphs with forbidden cycles, *J. Combin. Theory, Ser. B* 115 (2015), 210–223.

[6] N. Cohen, F. Havet, W. Lochet, and N. Nisse, Subdivisions of oriented cycles in digraphs with large chromatic number, *arXiv:1605.07762*

[7] A. El-Sahili, Paths with two blocks in k-chromatic digraphs, *Discrete Math.* 287 (2004), 151–153.

[8] A. El-Sahili, Trees in tournaments, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 92 (2004), 183–187.

[9] A. El-Sahili and M. Kouider, About paths with two blocks, *manuscript.*

[10] R. Häggkvist and A.G. Thomason, Trees in tournaments, *Combinatorica* 11 (1991), 123–130.

[11] F. Havet, Orientations and colouring of graphs, *manuscript.*

[12] F. Havet and S. Thomassé, Oriented Hamiltonian path in tournaments: A proof of Rosenfelds conjecture, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 78 (2000), 243–273.

[13] F. Havet and S. Thomassé, Median orders: A tool for the second neighborhood problem and Sumners conjecture, *J. Graph Theory* 35 (2000), 244–256.

[14] T. Gallai, On directed paths and circuits, in: *Theory of Graphs* (P. Erdős and G.O.H. Katona, Eds.), Academic Press, San Diego, 1968, 115–118.

[15] B. Roy, Nombre chromatique et plus longs chemins d'un graphe, *Rev. Française Informat. Recherche Opérationnelle* 1 (1967), 129–132.